

To all whom it may concern.

AN EXPLANATION
OF
MR. KILHAM'S STATEMENT
OF THE
Preachers' Allowance,

Intended for the Perusal of all Well-Wishers to

● *METHODISM.*

*I am become a Fool in glorying; ye have compelled me;
for I ought to have been commended of you:
though I be nothing.*

ST. PAUL.

NOTTINGHAM:

PRINTED AT SUTTON'S OFFICE, BRIDLESMITH GATE.

1796.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

MR. WILLIAM STANTON

President, American Association

of the History and Philosophy of Science

MASSACHUSETTS

Received of the American Association

of the History and Philosophy of Science

the sum of

Five Dollars

for the year 1900

MASSACHUSETTS

W. H. B. STANTON

50⁵/₁₅

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

DEAR FRIENDS,

WITHOUT we were to signify the reasons that induce us to give the following explanation, we should stand exposed to censures of a very unpleasant nature. Some might consider it as mere ostentation to represent our income in a light which will clearly demonstrate our *disinterestedness*; while others would mention it as a *meanness*, totally unworthy our character, thus to expose our pecuniary concerns. It will be sufficient to say, that a disagreeable necessity urges us to it: for though to speak on this subject be irksome—yet, to remain silent, while such mistaken representations are circulated abroad, is painful in the extreme.

Mr. Kilham, in a recent publication, entitled “A Candid Examination of the Methodistical Bull,” has given the following statement of the allowance for a preacher and his family: which, for want of a proper explanation, has occasioned much suspicion and jealousy, of a mercenary kind, in the minds of many of our well-meaning friends; as well as having been made the ground of the most cruel of reflections, and the most uncharitable of representations. We feel too acutely for our characters, and the prosperity of that cause to which we devote our labours, not to step forward and speak in behalf of the purity of our designs. A necessity is laid upon us to say something in our own defence. It has long been our *glory*, that we preach not for filthy lucre’s sake, but the love of souls.

Mr. K's. pamphlet would rob us of this glory, and sink us to the *base* character of hirelings. However, we are not unwilling to believe that he did not intend to convey such ideas to the public: but he has certainly done it; and we fear that the bad impressions made on the minds of many, will, more or less, prove injurious.

After all, we feel a persuasion that we have it in our power so to state matters of fact, as *fully* to convince all *reasonable* men, that our motives are still worthy the character of upright and disinterested ministers.

We shall, therefore, give Mr. K's. statement at large, and afterward proceed to an explanation, so as to enable us, by a *manifestation of the truth*, to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

THE STATEMENT,

Pages 18 and 19 of the Bull.

“ Our people have been exceedingly reproached by
 “ many respectable Dissenters and others, under the
 “ idea that they do not sufficiently provide for their
 “ ministers. To shew the unjustness of this charge,
 “ I shall state the allowance for preachers and their
 “ families, as it is granted them every where, without
 “ respect to age, abilities, or usefulness. And, I am
 “ bold to declare, there is not a connection under
 “ Heaven of such extent as ours; that supply their
 “ ministers by *free donations* as our people do us.

“ I will make the account for a preacher, with a
 “ wife and four children; intreating the Reader to
 “ observe, that our allowance is in proportion to the
 “ number of our family throughout all our circuits.

“ 1 Preacher's

	£.	s.	d.
" 1 Preacher's board at 10s. per week	26	0	0
" 2 Quarterage, travelling expences, and washing	15	10	0
" 3 Letters	1	0	0
" 4 Wife's yearly allowance	12	0	0
" 5 Three children at home	12	0	0
" 6 A boy at Kingswood school	20	0	0
" 7 Servants' wages	5	0	0
" 8 House rent, coal, and candles	12	0	0
" 9 Wear and tear of furniture	3	0	0
" 10 House linen washing	1	0	0
" In all	107	10	0

Upon extra-expences he further observes, " Every
 " person that reads this account, who is acquainted
 " with our affairs, must see that I have charged the
 " boy at Kingswood a third less than he costs now.
 " The house rent, coal and candle bill, is often near
 " twice as much as I have mentioned ;" more or less
 they stand as the 8th, 9th, and 10th articles, and can
 imply no gain to the family: as we shall hereafter
 explain. " I have made no charge for doctors' bills,
 " women lying in, afflictions in the family, the ex-
 " pence of horse keeping," he might have added, and
 horse shoeing, " attending the conference, and re-
 " moval of families. These are very considerable. But
 " as many of them are connected with the itinerant
 " plan, they cannot be avoided, and therefore have not
 " any thing to do with the preachers and families allow-
 " ance, abstracted from that plan."

We will allow that Mr. Kilham has published the above statement to the world for the reason he assigns; and will not deny, that, taking all things together, and considering our expences at large, his calculation is just in the whole. We never wish to conceal, that, on account of our peculiar situation, and the nature of our itinerant capacity, we must be *necessarily and unavoidably* a considerable expence to our societies *collectively*: yet notwithstanding we could make it appear, that we are the least expence to our societies, *individually*, of any ministers whatever who are dependant on their people at large. Let us suppose there are twenty-six societies in every circuit, that employ the labours of three preachers, (observe, not all married, and families of *four children*); these societies all contribute to the support of their preachers, so that no individual can think it an oppression. The case would be very different, if an individual congregation, or society, had to support a minister at the rate of 107l. 10s. a year. We now proceed to explain our real situation, and to give you a proper idea of the expences of our itinerant plan: in this we shall make it evident, that what we cost our people, at large, is *one thing*; and what is coming in to us as an emolument, to provide food and raiment for our families is *quite another*.

Article 1, Is a statement of the preacher's board at 10s. per week, which Mr. K. gives as if the preacher were continually resident with his family, and had that sum allowed to provide for himself; but the case is very different. The plan of his circuit will admit him
to

to board at home only every third week*. Let it be supposed, that, notwithstanding the dearness of provisions, he is able to supply himself for 7s. and the overplus shall go to his family. Three shillings every third week, will amount to 2l. 12s. in the whole year.

The difference occasioned by the itinerant plan will strike every one who attends to this explanation. While the preacher is travelling in his circuit, he is provided for at the several places where he has to preach, and whatever that provision may cost the respective societies, (though in many places it is no cost to them, as he is entertained by generous individuals,) there arises no gain to his family: nay; he never so much as beholds the money which is paid to defray the expence. Now were he to be constantly at home, and had the allowance as above, there would be an overplus of 3s. every week; so that he would gain 9s. to his family, while he now only gains 3s.

Article 2, Is the sum total of quarterage, travelling expences, and washing collectively. When divided,



* This is according to Nottingham circuit.—We will here observe, that in different circuits the allowance is different, as much as from 5s. to 10s. 6d. The last mentioned is the stated allowance per week at Nottingham. But you must be informed, that, according to the rotation of the circuit, the preacher dines at home six times in six weeks; besides being at home three days and three nights, in the course of twelve weeks, for which he receives no allowance. In most other circuits it is similar.

there

there will be, 1st, the sum of 12l. to provide him every necessary in clothing, books, charities, &c. Setting the two last-mentioned things aside, you are to consider that it is becoming a minister to be decent in his apparel. His constant travelling, and his being exposed to all weathers, tend much to facilitate the wear of his clothes; all these things considered, there are but very few, indeed, who will think the allowance to be any way extravagant. But you shall suppose he manages with 9l. and reserves 3l. towards his family expenditure. 2d, There are 2l. for travelling expences, which is all (and often more) expended, so that nothing is left here. 3d, There remains 1l. 10s. for washing; which, being done by the servant, comes into the family account.

Article 3, Is the charge of 1l. for letters. You must observe, that all the letters are paid for as they are received; be they more or less: so that not even a single halfpenny remains of this. We shall now take the liberty to thank Mr. K. for the great number of his circular letters, which have cost our societies very considerable.

Articles 4 and 5, Contain the sums expressly allowed for the clothing and maintenance of the preacher's wife and three children at home.

Article 6, Is the sum of 20l. paid out of the Kingwood collection, (a collection we make annually in all our congregations,) to the managers of that school, for a boy's education, board, clothing, and washing. If Mr. K. think the expence enormous, (as he seems further to suggest,) his complaint lies against the managers, and as all the supporters of that institution must naturally wish for every proper regulation, we see no objection

objection to HIM becoming the instrument of its reform. While we leave him to this work, we would observe, that all the advantage obtained here is the boys education, board, &c. from eight years old till he attain a proper age to be put out apprentice. But if any premium be required to engage him in a decent occupation, we would ask, from whence must it come? Or, if after he has served his time he should want some assistance to set him up in business, from what quarter must it arise? These are questions which will affect a stranger to parental solicitude the least of any.

Article 7, Is the sum allowed for servants wages; and

Articles 8, 9, and 10, The expences of house rent, coals, candles, and other necessaries. The statement of these can imply no more, than, that every circuit provides a house furnished for the accommodation of a preacher and his family; as likewise coals, candles, &c. more or less—better or worse: he finds it as they please to provide, and leaves it the same. So that whatever is expended on this account, does not so much as pass through a preacher's hands. Having just run over the several articles, we now collect together the sums left for the expenditure of the family.

	£.	s.	d.
From article 1st there remains	2	12	0
2d ditto	4	10	0
4th & 5th ditto	24	0	0
	31	2	0

FROM WHICH, DEDUCT

Children's schooling, 1s. <i>per week</i> ,	2	12	0
Soap and starch for 6 persons, 10d. <i>per week</i> ,	2	3	4
Subscription to the preacher's fund	1	1	0
	5	16	4

And there will remain the PRODIGAL sum of 25l. 5s. 8d. which, when divided, will not amount to 17d. a day, to provide food for five persons, (the maid inclusive,) and all the wearing apparel necessary for the wife and her three children. We almost wish Mr. K. was here, we would prevail upon him, if possible, to give us a lecture on economy; to teach us how to divide and apply this small pittance, so as to make it merely 'sufficient.' However, to dispose it as well as we can, we will venture to rate each person at 3d. a day for victuals, and then the remainder 2l. 9s. 5d. stands for raiment.

Upon what Mr. K. has said on extra expences, we observe, 1st, That, as these expences are only paid on a necessity, it might be mentioned as one proof amongst many others of disinterestedness; and that we aim not at wordly gain. If there be no necessity, we have no demand: if there be, our requirement is just as much; not a penny more. It might be very different if a good, handsome, round sum were to be allowed for the current extras of the year, whether there was any *real* necessity for it or not; and 2dly, If you accept the labours of a preacher, if he must devote all his time to the work of the ministry, we ask, ought not his necessary demands to be provided for? Is it not just that all his *reasonable* expences should be paid? Or, would you engage his services, and yet place him at the same time in a situation in which he is unable to provide for his household, and finds it *morally impossible* to live honestly in the sight of all men? We submit these questions to Honest Men and Christians.

We cannot mention it as an instance of Mr. K's generosity, that while he can say respecting extra expences,

pences, "as many of them are connected with the itinerant plan, they cannot be avoided, and therefore have not any thing to do with the preachers and families allowance abstracted from that plan:" he should nevertheless include travelling expences in his statement, as if *they* were not *unavoidably* "connected with the itinerant plan." Not to mention the erroneous idea he has given of the preacher's board in the 1st article, which, on the same ground, according to the explanation we have given, is a loss to the family of more than 5l. in the year. His inaccuracy in this, and many other instances, is too notorious to pass long without proper animadversion.

We have long been reproached, by the world, as a set of mercenary men, actuated by principles the most *base* and *unworthy*; going about, and imposing upon the simple and unwary: all which *unjust* reflections we have borne with patience, because they are of the world, and speak as the world, and the world heareth them. But for a *brother* to hold it out to the public, that we severally cost our societies 107l. 10s. a year, without an explanation; and shewing that out of all this *only* 25l. 5s. 8d. is left for the maintenance and clothing of the family, is a cruelty that will scarcely admit of any apology.

We have no prejudice against Mr. K. nor are we unfavourable to a reform in our connection, in what is judged necessary for its credit and prosperity; but we cannot help *feeling* that his misrepresented statement of a preacher's allowance convey ideas to the public, and even to many of our friends, exceedingly inimical to our peace and our prospect of doing good. Let any one
judge,

judge, even "respectable Dissenters and others," from the *real* statement we have given, (for the truth of which we appeal to our circuit, and town stewards who pay us our stipends,) whether the preachers are so "sufficiently provided for," as Mr. K. would make the world believe. However, if there should be an individual, or two, who think it a SUFFICIENCY, we feel no apprehension of any one calling it a SUPERFLUITY. But, perhaps, it will be asked by some who do not wish us to starve, how do you live? In answer to this, we have to say that those preachers, who have any property of their own, generally spend the interest of their fortune to support their families: nay, some are obliged to sink a part of their capital, which should, in all reason, (if Mr. K. will allow it) be preserved for their children. Those who have nothing independent must apply to their relations, and if there be no supply from that quarter, they are poor enough; Heaven can witness! In a late conference many were moved even to tears, to hear that a poor brother, in his severe necessity, was obliged to pawn some of his clothes, &c. We could enlarge here very considerably, but the disagreeableness of the subject forces us to decline. We ingenuously declare, that if in this life only we had hope, if our views were simply directed to worldly emoluments, we should soon renounce itinerancy as unfavourable to our purpose. But we are happy, inasmuch as our views open to us, in the Gospel; and while we continue to labour as the Messengers of Peace, we are entitled to say, that our work is the LORD'S, and our REWARD is with him. Our utmost wish respecting the good of this life, is to get through the world honestly;

nestly; comfortably we shall, while we are humbly following after our Divine pattern, while the sound of our Master's feet is behind us, and his supreme pleasure prospers with us.

O Brethren and Friends! where is the ground for your violent suspicion of the preachers vast emoluments? Were you who have fortunes equal to many of the preachers, to give as much to the general cause as some of them spend in *your service*, there would be no necessity either for yearly or Kingswood's collections, or subscriptions, to the preacher's fund.

Of all the ministers in the world, we thought we had the most reason to be happy, in the purity of our intentions, in preaching to you; and we never should have stepped forward to exhibit our *pinching* circumstances, if we had not been GORED by the "BULL." But as you have constrained us, notwithstanding all the mad Bulls in Bathan, we will GLORY; and (in the spirit of an Apostle) will venture to say, that our DISINTERESTEDNESS will appear evident to all, but the wilfully blind, or the perversely prejudiced: that our INTEGRITY will bid defiance to every suspicion on the ground of wordly emolument; and that our SINCERITY will demand your credit when we thus publicly declare, that, in all our travelling up and down, in all our works and labours as ministers of the WORD OF GRACE, our view is purely this, TO GAIN YOU—NOT YOURS.

We challenge any one to come forward, and disprove the statement of facts we have given. And let even *Prejudice blush*, to think that the preachers are spending their strength, and many of them their property, in your service, while not a few of you are amassing together

ther snug and comfortable fortunes for your wives and children.

The LORD be judge between you and us. Amen.

Published by order of the District,

THOMAS HANBY, Chairman.

NOTTINGHAM, May 26, 1796.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the above was sent to the Press, we have had the opportunity of perusing an anonymous pamphlet, entitled 'Free Enquiry,' &c. of which we consider Mr. Kilham to be a co-author. As this publication contains a paragraph or two, relative to the subject we have treated, we will bestow a few remarks upon them.

Our friends and the public are carefully apprized of three things. 1. The *easy* and *affluent* circumstances in which the preachers are placed; being "better provided
" for than Dissenting ministers in general, and than
" most of the curates in the Establishment in particu-
" lar." 2. The great danger there is of such elevated
circumstances hurting them, by "exposing them to the
" snares of sloth and worldly mindedness." It must be
especially noticed, that, "as many of our preachers have
" spent the early part of their lives in stations not higher
" than labouring mechanics, they are placed in com-
" parative ease and affluence when they commence
" itinerants. So far from itinerancy being a sacrifice
" to them, it is a manifest promotion." And "many
" things

" things occur daily, which tend to sink them into security and Laodicean ease." So that, " unless their hearts are filled with faith and love," their promotion and affluence " must be a curse to themselves, and they " a curse to the people." 3. The caution necessary to be used, in appointing or receiving candidates for the ministry. For " poverty exposes men to temptations, " and may lead them to take improper steps to obtain " the good things of this life." And " strong temptations (are) held out *for the lowest of the people to become " preachers amongst us.*" So that there is evidently great danger " of their undertaking this office from no better a motive, than for the sake of filthy lucre." See pages 10, 11, and 12.

To the first, we shall only say (for the present) that our readers will be able to form an idea of OUR EASY and AFFLUENT circumstances; and whether those are very *exact*, who affirm, that we are " better provided for than " Dissenting ministers in general, and than most of the " curates in the Establishment in particular." As to the second, we hope no temptation will happen to us, but what is common to men; and we think it is not impossible for a way to be opened for our escape. Suppose us to be destitute of every conscientious principle, and to be the *meanest* HIRELINGS that ever existed; yet, we apprehend, that while we have the eyes of so many of our MASTERS upon us, it will not be an easy thing to indulge our " sloth and wordly mindedness" to any great excess. Perhaps it would not be disagreeable to the authors of such insinuations, to lay, in the way of those who have not as yet found " itinerancy to place " them in comparative ease and affluence," a *strong*

temptation to bid you an adieu; and leave you with those to whom "itinerancy is far from being a sacrifice" but a manifest promotion." Important advantages might arise from such a circumstance. As none would remain but those who are dependant upon the people for their promotion; their love of ease and affluence, together with the horrible dread of being degraded to labouring mechanics again, would powerfully operate to make them obsequious. Then, as clay in hands of the potter, you might *mould* and *fashion* them according TO YOUR PLEASURE. With respect to the third particular, we do not wonder, that "the lowest order of the" people find strong temptations to commence itinerants," so long as they are taught to believe that the clear sum of 107l. 10s. per annum, is allowed a preacher for the maintenance of himself and his family. We ask, who that loves money can withstand such a temptation as this? But we entertain an opinion, that the explanation we have given, will rather weaken the power of this temptation. We can assure all such, of the lowest order, that we do not enjoy so many of the "good things of this life," as they are taught to imagine. If they can procure a bare sufficiency, without any one upbraiding them with it, they ought to be very thankful; for it is more than many of us can boast of. But to dismiss the subject. The fact must be either, the preachers have more than a sufficiency allowed them; or they have not. If any of our friends can manifest the former, we are very willing to be reduced. But we are persuaded, the more they search into the matter, the more they will be convinced of our scanty affluence. And should we

we be called upon, we pledge ourselves to prove, that *all things* considered, our allowance is not *even* a sufficiency. We ask then, is it handsome, or gentleman-like, to give us *ONLY* what we deserve, and can demand as the *hire* of our labours; then smite us in the face!—treat us as a set of thieves!!—and advertise us to the world as a company of worldly-minded men? Put your *HONORABLESELVES* in our places, and get acquainted with the feelings that such treatment will naturally produce.

But here is an apology, “We have no intention to “insinuate any thing against any man.” While we have understanding to read and judge for ourselves, (pardon us for presuming,) we must declare, that your publication teems with insinuations the most illiberal. To pass over a great number, that may readily be decyphered, we will notice two that are too legible to be misunderstood.

I. That the preachers, in general, are destitute of common capacity.

II. That they are wanting of common honesty.

1st, That the preachers, in general, are void of common capacity, is a striking feature of the paragraphs we have quoted. That they have not even a capacity to labour, and procure a sufficient maintenance, is easily understood; for *BARELY FOOD AND RAIMENT*, is “comparative ease and affluence.” That they could ever have bettered their circumstances, (like many who *now* stand on elevated ground, and manifest a pleasure in bespattering the poor itinerants,) must not even be supposed of such consummate blockheads; for a *scanty maintenance* is a “*MANIFEST PROMOTION*” to them.

2d, That the preachers are wanting of common honesty, is the broad and open countenance of a rule, proposed in the "outlines of a constitution," page 86. "In the country places let (the quarterage) be sent in "by the leader to the circuit stewards, if (the steward of "that society) cannot attend himself. But every society "that has a steward, should urge him to attend, that "every thing may be transacted to their advantage. "If the preacher take it in," observe, only to befriend the steward, and save him the trouble of attending himself, "let him have a note from the leader, specifying "the sum to the circuit steward." We ask, with submission, suppose the society steward should attend himself, will it not be equally necessary for him to bring a note specifying the sum? You say nothing to this; so that we are left to infer, that any man may be trusted sooner than a methodist preacher! O pitiful Legislation!!! The language of such a rule is, 'Brethren and 'Friends be upon your guard, and act with caution!! 'for we suspect the preachers as wanting even common 'honesty. We dare not say, that there is a man among 'them that can safely be trusted with a shilling. We 'advise you always to send your quarterage in to the 'circuit steward, by some honest man, if possible. If 'you cannot, do not entrust a preacher with it, without 'a note, specifying the sum, to put it out of his power 'to cheat you: *for his word, as well as his honesty, is not 'to be depended upon.*' But "honesty never shrinks at responsibility." No; nevertheless, it will spurn at such illiberal representations. 'To prove the necessity of 'such a law, we can produce instances where individuals
' have

‘ have not attended to strict honesty.’ Produce them without any further hesitation. Let the guilty answer for themselves, and let the innocent go free; and let us be ashamed to immortalize our jealousies by such puerile statutes. ‘ But money is a great temptation to a poor ‘ man.’ We beseech you lead us not into temptation; but keep your money out of our sight. And if you will hearken to our petition, we pray you never to trust us with your money in any shape whatever: no; not even with a note specifying the sum. For as “ the love of “ money is the root of all evil,” which of you dare say, that men of such principles will not practice a forgery upon the note, by altering the sum, and by this artifice cheat the stewards after all!! We treat these insinuations with greater indignation, because, as they are stated to the public, they must operate in a general way. For when it is given out, that there is a company of dishonest men in a certain community, and these not identified; the public, being unable to distinguish the innocent from the guilty, will naturally be in doubt of every one; and in this way every itinerant will be suspected in his turn.

That the people should have a voice in the appointment of their stewards, and that they should be satisfied with respect to the disbursement of the money, will perfectly agree with our sentiments. But that we must be so far suspected of common honesty, as not to be trusted, *occasionally*, to bring in the quarterage; and that a rule should be enacted to confirm and perpetuate the suspicion, is a disgrace that *very few* of us will look upon as being called to bear. The misconduct of an individual (supposing it possible to instance it) can have no weight
here;

here; for all must see the injustice of suspecting and treating the disciples of Christ as a set of dishonest men, because Judas was a thief, and had the bag.

We do not much wonder that Mr. Suter should solemnly declare, "if such a rule should be established, he would leave the connection immediately." The reasons of such a determination we conceive to be nearly allied to the following questions. What satisfaction, or what prospect of success, can a minister have in labouring amongst a people that violently suspects his honesty? And what hope can he entertain, that his fidelity shall obtain their credit when his word will not be taken for a shilling? We do not hesitate to say, that the force of such sentiments will be felt by *several others*, in a degree equal to what Mr. S. did. And if such circumstances should ever happen, we shall still consider it to be a *vile and uncharitable* representation for any one to *insinuate*, that such preachers left the connection, because they were not *tolerated to sell their horses, and pocket the money!!!* See A. Kilham's Trial, page 17.

Although Mr. K. has said much respecting the plan of disbursement in the preacher's fund, we confess we have not seen argument sufficient to convince us, that it is, in all its parts, so *monstrously* inequitable as he declares it to be; nor can we see it deserving of all that **EXECRATION** he has bestowed upon it. The optional plan, which he so *passionately* contends for, will admit of many objections. Not to mention other objections, we shall only say that, 1st, It is liable, in most cases, to *dissatisfaction* on the part of the receiver; and 2d, It is
equally

equally liable to *inequity* on the part of the giver. A thought of Mr. Crowther's, upon this subject, is worthy of notice. 'If the annual allowance of superannuated preachers were to depend upon an annual representation of their circumstances, they would, in many cases, be under strong temptations, to dread the frowns, or court the smiles of every successive assistant who shall be sent to the circuit where they reside. Such a discretionary power would probably produce more abuses in the distribution of the money, and bring more affliction upon individuals than the present plan is ever likely to do. Can it be less than *cruelty* for the superannuated Heralds of the Gospel, or their helpless and disconsolate widows, to be exposed to the mercy or caprice of persons, whom they, perhaps, never knew till they were rendered necessitous by age or bodily infirmity?'

As we do not intend to enter into a minute investigation of the subject, we will only suggest a thought or two, and then take our leave of it for the present. We are far from thinking the present rule of disbursement incapable of improvement; nay, we think some amendment *ought* to be made. Suppose a general rule (admitting of proper exceptions) could be fixed upon, to stipulate a sufficient sum for the support of every *necessitous* claimant; whether they have travelled, as preachers in full Connection, less or more, to a certain number of years. If a preacher have travelled, and subscribed for a course of years beyond that number, we ask, ought he not to possess an advantage equivalent to his subscription? That a preacher, who has subscribed for a
number

number of years at the hazard of *receiving nothing*, should have a chance in ratio to his subscription: is not in our judgment to be looked upon as such an ABOMINATION!! and we hope that *even* Mr. K. himself, will not, on second thoughts, call it either UNJUST OR UNREASONABLE.

What we have now suggested will appear to stand on the two following principles: MERCY and JUSTICE. Those who have not travelled a sufficient number of years, to give them a claim on the score of their subscription, may look upon themselves as relieved by the donation of our friends. The annual subscription of our friends may properly be considered in this view, as making up the *deficiency* of those who could not on the ground of their own subscription *claim a sufficiency*. But those who have subscribed beyond a certain number of years, may be considered to have a *just and equitable* claim in ratio to their subscription; and whatever may be given to the fund, by way of *voluntary* contribution, cannot affect their claim, while we look upon it as standing on the principles of Justice.

Several of the cases that Mr. K. has stated, prove nothing but his *dexterity* in exemplification.

It is not because Mr. K. has shewn his opinion, or that he professes himself to be a friend to REFORM, and urges the necessity of it with all his power, that we seem to be opposed to him; but because of the *random* and *unguarded* manner in which he aids his profession.

The following questions, we think, deserve mature deliberation:

1st, In what point of light must Mr. K. be placed in, to appear as an honorable man in the eyes of our friends
in

in general, when he publicly accuses preachers not *identified*, and pledges himself to substantiate the charges in conference? which to them may be considered as *private*. Is it a matter of no importance, to be able to *distinguish* and know whether a *worthy* or *unworthy* character ministers to them?

2d, What must be the embarrassment of conference on this head? Suppose he both identity and substantiate all he has pledged, and neither he, nor the conference, acquaint the public with the particulars, will not the world be at liberty to conjecture that nine out of ten were guilty!! and that the matter was only *huddled* up for fear of an exposure?

3d, How are we to consider him as a friend to the Connection? If he know of any misdemeanor, ought he not *immediately* and *positively* to bring a charge against the offender, that he may be fairly tried, and either acquitted as a honest man, or dismissed as a criminal? Is it the part of a man, but especially a **PROFESSED FRIEND**, to keep such things as a *reserve*, to enable him to **UPBraid** and **STIGMATIZE** the Connection in time to come? we further ask, does Mr. K. pay a strict attention to that Gospel rule, Matt. xviii. 15, &c. and are we to look upon his present conduct as the last step in that *evangelical* process? and,

4th, How far have the innocent a right to complain? since many of his accusations must operate in a general way; his asserting, that he believes the greater part of the preachers are honest, upright men, does not sufficiently relieve us: the innocent (as we have before explained) must feel themselves aggrieved, with being
exposed

exposed to cruel suspicions by his unthinking procedure. We ask, as individuals, what have we done to deserve such a treatment? Is it reasonable, that because somebody has affronted him, and deserves to be bored through the ear, we must all be served in like manner?

If Mr. K. and his co-adjutors be FINALLY DETERMINED upon a seperation, there is no mystery in their proceedings. But if they wish to unite the hearts of the preachers and people together, we are extremely sorry that their PRUDENCE is not equal to the *purity* of their *design*.

“Jesu Lord, we look to thee,

“Let us in thy name agree:

“Shew thyself the Prince of Peace;

“*Bid our jars for ever cease.*”

FINIS.

